REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-2, 4, 5, 7-14, and 16-24 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 22-24 have been amended. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments. Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,701,487 to Arbouzov ("Arbouzov"). Claims 1 and 22-24 were amended to further clarify the claimed invention.

Independent claim 1, as amended, is reproduced below for the Examiner's convenience.

> 1.   A method of automatically generating data regarding errors in a software system, the software system including one or more software components, the method comprising:
>
>   examining contents of one or more files indicating one or more errors in the software system to determine one or more of the software components responsible for the errors and a number of the errors attributed to each of the software components determined to be responsible for the errors, wherein the one or more of the files examined comprises a history of one or more errors **in the software system** generated during execution of the software system; and
>
>   determining a size of the one or more software components responsible for the errors.

Arbouzov, does not teach or suggest, for example, "one or more of the files examined comprises a history of one or more errors in the software system generated during execution of the

software system." As recited in amended independent claim 1, the history of one or more errors refers to at least one **error in the software system** that was generated **during execution of the software system**. In contrast, Arbouzov discloses, for example, a compilation system which when executed identifies errors in a software program, which is separate and independent of the compilation system. (See Arbouzov, abstract; column 5, lines 49-51; lines column 6, lines 14-16). Accordingly, Arbouzov does not refer to errors in the compilation system itself as the compilation system is executed. Instead, Arbouzov refers to, for example, errors occurring in a separate source program when the source program is being compiled by the compilation system of Arbouzov. Hence, Arbouzov does not teach or suggest, for example, "one or more of the files examined comprises a history of one or more errors in the software system generated during execution of the software system." Accordingly, Arbouzov does not teach or suggest each and every element of amended independent claim 1 and therefore, amended independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Amended independent claims 22-24 recite similar, albeit different limitations as amended independent claim 1. At least for the reasons noted above, Arbouzov does not teach or suggest each and every element of amended independent claims 22-24. Accordingly, amended independent claims 22-24 are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Arbouzov in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,745,348 to Chung *et al.* ("Chung"). Claims 2 and 16 depend from independent claim 1. Chung does not overcome the above-noted deficiency of Arbouzov. Hence, for at least the above reasons, Arbouzov and Chung, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of each of the claims 2 and 16. Accordingly, claims 2 and 16 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Arbouzov in view of Chung and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,824 to Ruhlen *et al.*

("Ruhlen"). Claims 4 and 5 depend from independent claim 1. Ruhlen does not overcome the above-noted deficiency of Arbouzov. Hence, for at least the above reasons, Arbouzov, Chung, and Ruhlen, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of each of the claims 4 and 5. Accordingly, claims 4 and 5 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 7-9, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Arbouzov in view of Chung in view of Ruhlen and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,769,114 to Leung ("Leung"). Claims 7-9, 13, and 14 depend from independent claim 1. Leung does not overcome the above-noted deficiency of Arbouzov. Hence, for at least the above reasons, Arbouzov, Chung, Ruhlen and Leung, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of each of the claims 7-9, 13, and 14. Accordingly, claims 7-9, 13, and 14 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 10-12 and 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Arbouzov in view of Chung in view of Ruhlen and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,493 to Hanson ("Hanson"). Claims 10-12, and 17-21 depend from independent claim 1. Hanson does not overcome the above-noted deficiency of Arbouzov. Hence, for at least the above reasons, Arbouzov, Chung, Ruhlen and Hanson, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of each of the claims 10-12 and 17-21. Accordingly, claims 10-12 and 17-21 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that the pending application is in condition for allowance. Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that the prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although only certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentable. Applicant reserves the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Dated: June 8, 2007   Respectfully submitted,

                                            By _____
                                            John W. Branch
                                            Registration No.: 41,633
                                            DARBY & DARBY P.C.
                                            P.O. Box 5257
                                            New York, New York 10150-5257
                                            (206) 262-8900 ▫ (212) 527-7701 fax
                                            Attorneys/Agents For Applicant